UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,730	02/23/2004	Mario I. Wolczko	SUN030248	9462

66083   7590   09/19/2007
SUN MICROSYSTEMS, INC. c/o DORSEY & WHITNEY, LLP
370 SEVENTEENTH ST.
SUITE 4700
DENVER, CO 80202

EXAMINER
JOHNSON, BRIAN P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2183	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/19/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

_2V_

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/784,730	WOLCZKO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Brian P. Johnson	2183

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _09 July 2007_.

2a)☒ This action is FINAL.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-19_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-19_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

1.   Claims 1-19 have been examined.

Acknowledgment of papers filed: amendments and remarks on 03 July 2007.

The papers filed have been placed on record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3.   Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chrysos

(U.S. Patent No. 6,148,396).

4.   Regarding claims 1 and 6, Chrysos discloses a method of linking control transfer

information with sampling information (col 5 lines 40-42) for instructions executing in a

processor (col 2 line 17) comprising: storing information relating to execution events (col

1 lines 28-31) in a history queue (fig. 3) including at least one program counter value for

a control transfer event (col. 11 lines 53-54); selecting an instruction for sampling (col 5

lines 39-42); storing information relating to the instruction for sampling (col 5 lines 44-

48); freezing the information relating to execution events in the history queue when the

information relating to the instruction for sampling is to be reported to provide frozen

execution event information (col 5 lines 45-58);

Note that the "frozen" information is considered to be the profile information

saved into the registers.

Reporting the information relating to the instruction for sampling; and, enabling

access to the frozen execution event information (col 6 lines 41-44) in the history queue

(fig. 3).

5.   Regarding claims 2 and 7, Chrysos discloses the method of claims 1 and 6

further comprising: freezing the execution event information provides information to

enable reconstructing an execution path of events adjoining the instruction (col 6 lines

42-45).

6.   Regarding claims 3 and 8, Chrysos discloses the method of claims 1 and 6

wherein: the storing information relating to execution events and the storing information

relating to the instruction occur within separate structures of a processor (col 5 lines 45-

48 and fig 3).

Note that the citation discloses that the profile information is saved in a set of

internal profile registers.

7.   Regarding claims 4 and 9, Chrysos discloses the method of claims 1 and 6

wherein: the freezing the information relating to execution events disables storing of

additional information relating to execution events (col 5 lines 45-48).

Note that this claims appears to be referring to paragraph 28 of Applicant's

specification. Paragraph 28 states that profile information is not overwritte in certain

circumstances. Note that line 47 particularly states that the information is

"accumulated" rather than updated/removed.

8.   Regarding claims 5 and 10, Chrysos discloses the method of claims 1 and 6

further comprising: enabling storing information relating to execution events occurring

after execution of the instruction for sampling (col 9 lines 48-50 or col 5 lines 60-62).

Note that the retired information can be considered to be information relating to

execution events occuring after execution of the instruction (for sampling or otherwise).

9.   Regarding claim 11, Chrysos discloses a processor (col 2 line 17) comprising: an

instruction pipeline (col 2 lines 25-26); a sampling mechanism coupled to the instruction

pipeline (fig 3--in combination with additional processor circuitry), the sampling

mechanism selecting an instruction for sampling and storing information relating to the

instruction for sampling (col 5 lines 44-48); a history queue coupled to the pipeline, the

history queue (fig 3)

Note that, in view of paragraph [0007] of Applicant's specification, the "history

queue" appears to be a mechanism "which records most recent control transfers", which

happens to be the case with the mechanism shown in figure 3 of Chrysos.

Storing information relating to execution events (col 11 lines 30-32), the history

queue freezing the information relating to execution events when the information

relating to the instruction for sampling is to be reported to provide frozen execution

event information (col 5 lines 44-48) so as to enable linking control transfer information

with sampling information for instructions executing in the processor (col 5 lines 54-62).

10.   Regarding claim 12, Chrysos discloses the processor of claim 11 wherein: the

sampling mechanism reports the information relating to the instruction for sampling (col

5 lines 44-48).

Note that the "sampling mechanism" is considered to be the mechanism used to

complete the sampling functionality specified in the citation.

11.   Regarding claim 13, Chrysos discloses the processor of claim 11 wherein: the

history queue enables access to the frozen execution event information (col 6 lines 41-

44).

12.   Regarding claim 14, Chrysos discloses the processor of claim 11 wherein:

freezing the execution event information provides information to enable reconstructing

an execution path of events adjoining the instruction (col 5 lines 54-60).

13.   Regarding claim 15, Chrysos discloses the processor of claim 11 wherein:

freezing the information relating to execution events disables storing of additional

information relating to execution events (col 5 lines 45-48).

Note: see claim 4.

14.   Regarding claim 16, Chrysos discloses the processor of claim 11 wherein: the

history queue stores information relating to execution events occurring after execution

of the instruction for sampling (col 5 lines 60-62).

Note that information related to "whether the instruction was retired or abored" is

determined after execution.

15.   Regarding claim 17, Chrysos discloses a method of monitoring control transfer

information for instructions executing in a processor (col 5 lines 44-48) comprising:

storing information relating to execution events (col 5 lines 44-48) in a history queue

(fig. 3) including at least one program counter value for a control transfer event (col 11

lines 53-54); freezing the information relating to execution events in this history queue

when the information relating to the instruction is to be reported to provide frozen

execution event information (col 5 lines 54-62); and, enabling access to the frozen

execution event information (col 6 lines 41-44) in the history queue (fig. 3).

16.   Regarding claim 18, Chrysos discloses the method of claim 17 wherein: the

freezing occurs based upon an instruction sample being reported (col 5 lines 44-46).

17.   Regarding claim 19, Chrysos discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the control

transfer event is selected from the group consisting of control transfer instruction

resolved taken, instruction flush performed, and instruction trap taken (col 10 lines 25-

27).

*Examiner asserts that the wording of this claim is similar to an "or clause",
requiring only one of the listed elements to be found in prior art. A PC is saved for a
control transfer instruction (branch instruction) that is resolved taken when those
instructions are chosen to be sampled.*

Response to Arguments

18.   Applicant's arguments filed 9 January 2007 have been fully considered but they
are not persuasive.

19.   Applicant argues that the amendments of the independent claims make the
current rejection improper. Examiner disagrees. Claim 1, as amended requires that the
history queue (fig. 3) to have a plurality of entries (in particular, 310, 320, 330, 340, and
350; col 11 lines 35-37). These entries are clearly shown in the figure.

Applicant also amended to require the queue to store "one or more" program
counters. Chrysos still discloses this limitation. The claim, as amended, does not
require that the memory system in fig. 3 hold program counters. The "or clause" within
the claim requires that only one of the elements be found in prior art. In particular, the
element found in Chrysos is "one program counter". Nothing in the claim requires
multiple program counters stored simultaneously in the queue.

Finally, Applicant amended to specify that prior art must sample instructions that
are not control transfer events. Chrysos col 5 lines 43-48 clearly shows that the

instructions chosen are random. These random instructions include instructions that are not control transfer instructions.

Conclusion

20.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian P. Johnson whose telephone number is (571) 272-2678. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie Chan can be reached on (571) 272-4162. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

EDDIE CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100